

REMARKS

The Office Action¹ dated May 27, 2008, objected to the specification,² objected to claims 1 and 57 for minor informalities,³ provisionally rejected claim 19 on grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over claim 12 of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/720,944, provisionally rejected claim 1 on grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over claim 38 of copending U.S. Patent Application No. 10/858,973,⁴ and rejected claims 1-10, 19-28, 37-46, and 57-59 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,917,817 to Dunn et al. ("*Dunn*").

¹ The Office Action may contain a number of statements characterizing the cited references and/or the claims which Applicants may not expressly identify herein. Regardless of whether or not any such statement is identified herein, Applicants do not automatically subscribe to, or acquiesce in, any such statement. Further, silence with regard to rejection of a dependent claim, when such claim depends, directly or indirectly, from an independent claim which Applicants deem allowable for reasons provided herein, is not acquiescence to such rejection of that dependent claim, but is recognition by Applicants that such previously lodged rejection is moot based on remarks and/or amendments presented herein relative to that independent claim.

² Applicants respectfully note that, although the body of the Office Action indicates an objection to the specification, the Office Action Summary page fails to indicate such an objection at box (9) of the Office Action Summary page.

³ Applicants respectfully note that, although the body of the Office Action indicates an objection to claims 1 and 57 for minor informalities, the Office Action Summary page fails to indicate such an objection at box (7) of the Office Action Summary page.

⁴ Applicants note that the Office Action does not explicitly reject claim 1 on grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting, but instead states that "similarly [to claim 19], claim 1... is a broad version of claim 38 of another co-pending application No. 10/858,973." (OA at p. 4) (emphasis supplied). Applicants therefore believe the Examiner intended to reject both claims 1 and 19 on grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting, and respond accordingly.

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 5-10, 19, 24-28, 37, 41-46, and 57-59. Claims 11-18, 29-36, and 47-56 have been withdrawn. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 5-9, 19, 24-27, 37, 41-45, and 57-59 can be found at least at pages 37, 38, and 44 of the originally filed specification.

Regarding the objection to the specification, Applicants amend the specification as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

Regarding the objections to claims 1 and 57 for minor informalities, Applicants amend claims 1 and 57 to correct the minor informalities. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections to claims 1 and 57.

Regarding the provisional rejection of claim 1 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of copending U.S. Application No. 10/858,973, in accordance with M.P.E.P. §§ 804 and 1490, and without admitting or even agreeing with the Examiner's allegations of double patenting, and while reserving the right to traverse the Examiner's allegations of double patenting in the future, Applicants defer responding to the provisional double patenting rejection until it is the only rejection remaining in the two applications, and the Examiner withdraws the provisional double-patenting rejection as to one application and permits that application to issue as a patent, thereby converting the provisional double patenting rejection in the remaining application into a double patenting rejection at the time the other application issues as a patent.

Regarding the provisional rejection of claim 19 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of copending U.S. Application No.

10/720,944, in accordance with M.P.E.P. §§ 804 and 1490, and without admitting or even agreeing with the Examiner's allegations of double patenting, and while reserving the right to traverse the Examiner's allegations of double patenting in the future, Applicants defer responding to the provisional double patenting rejection until it is the only rejection remaining in the two applications, and the Examiner withdraws the provisional double-patenting rejection as to one application and permits that application to issue as a patent, thereby converting the provisional double patenting rejection in the other application into a double patenting rejection at the time the remaining application issues as a patent.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-10, 19-28, 37-46, and 57-59 as being anticipated by *Dunn* for at least the reason that *Dunn* does not teach or suggest each and every recitation of amended independent claims 1, 19, 37, and 57-59. To anticipate a claim, a reference must teach every element of the claim. M.P.E.P. § 2131 (8th ed. 2001, revised August 2007).

For example, *Dunn* does not teach at least, "receiving. . . , contact information indicative of a second user. . . and line management information related to two or more communications lines associated with an account for the first user; and. . . transmitting an instruction. . . to implement a modification. . . based on the contact information and the line management information" as recited by amended independent claims 1 and 37. Further, *Dunn* does not teach at least "receiving. . . , contact information indicative of a second user and line management information related to one or more communications lines. . . and transmitting an instruction. . . to implement a modification based on the contact information and the line management information" as recited by amended

independent claims 57 and 59. Moreover, *Dunn* does not teach at least, “one or more processors configured to receive. . . , contact information indicative of a second user. . . and line management information related to two or more communications lines associated with an account for the first user; and. . . transmit an instruction. . . to implement a modification. . . based on the contact information and the line management information” as recited by amended independent claim 19. In addition, *Dunn* does not teach at least, “one or more processors configured to receive. . . , contact information indicative of a second user. . . and line management information related to one or more communications lines associated with an account for the first user; and. . . transmit an instruction. . . to implement a modification. . . based on the contact information and the line management information” as recited by amended independent claim 58.

Therefore, because *Dunn* does not disclose each and every element of amended independent claims 1, 19, 37, and 57-59, the Section 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 19, 37, and 57-59 should be withdrawn and the claims deemed allowable. Likewise, dependent claims 2-10, 20-28, and 38-46 should be allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from amended independent claims 1, 19, and 37, respectively.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 27, 2008

By: 
James G. Bell
Reg. No. 62,694
(202) 408-4000